



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,287	07/27/2001	James McNabb	RELI-001/01US	6095
29315	7590	12/19/2005	EXAMINER	
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC			STRANGE, AARON N	
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD			ART UNIT	
SUITE 900			PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA 20190			2153	

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/915,287	MCNABB ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron Strange	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-29 and 31-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02072005</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-10 in the reply filed on 9/27/2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "a thorough search and examination of any one claim set would necessarily encompass the search and examination of the remaining claims". This is not found persuasive because inventions II, III, and IV, as discussed in the restriction requirement of 6/27/2005, do not require the system of invention I, nor will invention I necessarily incorporate the methods of inventions II, III, and IV.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

Art Unit: 2153

was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

5. With regard to claim 1, the limitation “wherein said turnstile identifies one or more network elements in a communication path between said turnstile and said director, and wherein said director logically connects said turnstile with a particular one of said plurality of participant managers based on said one or more network elements” does not appear to be described in the specification.

While the specification does discuss the turnstile locating its corresponding participant manager (Page 38, Lines 6-13), it fails to describe the director logically connecting the turnstile to a particular participant manager based on one or more network elements identified by the turnstile.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1,4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Clark et al. (WO 01/22725).

8. With regard to claim 1, Clark discloses a system for managing a plurality of participants to a event comprising:

a director having an address associated therewith for delivering the event to the plurality of participants (interface server IS1) (Page 29, Lines 14-16);

a plurality of participant managers installed within a network communication system and logically connected amongst themselves and to said director thereby forming a hierarchy (mapping servers) (Fig 1 and Page 30, Lines 8-12); and

a turnstile installed at and associated with each of the plurality of participants, each turnstile logically connected to one of said plurality of participant managers in said hierarchy (set top box STB1 logically connects to mapping server via director) (Fig 1 and Page 29, lines 16-18),

wherein said turnstile identifies one or more network elements (subscriber access network SAN) in a communication path between said turnstile and said director, and

wherein said director logically connects said turnstile with a particular one of said plurality of participant managers based on said one or more network elements between said turnstile and said director (local mapping server is chosen) (Page 29, lines 16-18).

9. With regard to claim 4, Clark further discloses that said associated participant presents said turnstile with a ticket to the event to gain access to the event (profile and authentication is provided via smart card) (Page 25, Lines 4-12).

10. With regard to claim 5, Clark further discloses that said turnstile determines whether said ticket is valid (Page 25, Lines 4-12).

11. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Savage, III et al. (US 2001/0009014).

12. With regard to claim 1, Savage discloses a system for managing a plurality of participants to a event comprising:

a director (dispatch server) having an address (IP address) associated therewith for delivering the event to the plurality of participants (client connects to conference via dispatch server)(¶48-51);

a plurality of participant managers (media servers) installed within a network communication system and logically connected amongst themselves and to said director thereby forming a hierarchy (media servers are accessed via dispatch server)(Fig 1 and ¶1); and

a turnstile (client plug-in) installed at and associated with each of the plurality of participants, each turnstile logically connected to one of said plurality of participant managers in said hierarchy (§47),

wherein said turnstile identifies one or more network elements (authentication server) in a communication path between said turnstile and said director (§48), and

wherein said director logically connects said turnstile with a particular one of said plurality of participant managers based on said one or more network elements between said turnstile and said director (client is connected to appropriate server to access conference) (§51-53).

13. With regard to claim 2, Savage further discloses that said plurality of participant managers propagates delivery statistics upstream through said hierarchy to said director (media servers notify dispatch server of available capacity, QOS, crashes, etc) (§54 and 58).

14. With regard to claim 3, Savage further discloses that said plurality of participant managers aggregates said delivery statistics from those of said plurality of participants beneath it in the hierarchy (number of users/conferences/CPU units are monitored and aggregated into an "available capacity") (§54).

15. With regard to claim 4, Savage further discloses that said associated participant presents said turnstile with a ticket to the event to gain access to the event (authentication code/account number)(¶47).

16. With regard to claim 5, Savage further discloses that said turnstile determines whether said ticket is valid (¶48).

17. With regard to claim 8, Savage further discloses that said director provides event information to said connected participant manager (dispatch server notifies media server to create new conference) (¶53).

18. With regard to claim 9, Savage further discloses that said turnstile prevents said associated participant from receiving the event until a ticket associated with the event is authenticated (¶48).

19. With regard to claim 10, Savage further discloses that said turnstile prevents said associated participant from receiving the event until a ticket associated with the event is determined to have been provided to said associated participant (¶47-48).

### ***Conclusion***

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.




21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 571-272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AS  
12/7/2005

  
GLEYTON S. BURGESS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100